



south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Learning. Leadership. Service.

School Improvement Grants LEA (District) Application

**Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act**

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0682

Due Date

?

South Dakota Department of Education

Mackay Office Building, Title I Office
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

Grant Period Ends

June 30, 2014

FY 2010

School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Cover page

Legal Name of Applicant:		Applicant's Mailing Address:	
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: . Position and Office: Contact's Mailing Address:		Telephone: Fax: Email address:	
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name):		Telephone:	
I certify that the program person identified above is authorized to act on behalf of the institution with regard to the School Improvement Grants. X _____ Signature of the LEA Superintendent		Date:	
The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.			

ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION STATEMENT: The above named applicant assures the South Dakota Department of Education that these projects will be administered in compliance with the assurances contained in its current consolidated application for the Title I part A program, with state and federal laws and regulations applicable to the use of these funds, that the information contained in this application is accurate and complete.

Name of Authorized Representative (Type or Print): _____

Original Signature of Authorized Representative: _____

Date: _____

SD Department of Education use only	
Date Received:	_____ Signature of authorized SD DOE staff person

Guidelines

Purpose of Grant

The School Improvement Grants (SIG) program is authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Under section 1003(g)(1) of the ESEA, the Secretary must “award grants to States to enable the States to provide subgrants to local educational agencies for the purpose of providing assistance for school improvement consistent with section 1116.” From a grant received pursuant to that provision, a State educational agency (SEA) must subgrant at least 95 percent of the funds it receives to its local educational agencies (LEAs) for school improvement activities. In awarding such subgrants, an SEA must “give priority to the local educational agencies with the lowest-achieving schools that demonstrate — (A) the greatest need for such funds; and (B) the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the goals under school and local educational improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans under section 1116.” The regulatory requirements expand upon these provisions, further defining LEAs with the “greatest need” for SIG funds and the “strongest commitment” to ensuring that such funds are used to raise substantially student achievement in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, which was signed into law by President Obama on December 16, 2009, included two critical changes to the SIG program. First, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 allows SEAs and LEAs to use SIG funds to serve certain “newly eligible” schools (*i.e.*, certain low-achieving schools that are not Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring). Second, the law increases the amount that an SEA may

award for each school participating in the SIG program from \$50,000 annually to \$2 million annually.

Clarification of Available School Improvement Funds

There are two opportunities for additional funding for Title I schools in improvement status. These funds are distributed according to statute in Title I Part A 1003(a) and 1003(g).

The funds available under School Improvement 1003(a) - Formula grants have been and will continue to be allocated on a formula basis to all districts with Title I schools in improvement. These funds are to be used at each Title I school in school improvement based on the allocation for that school.

School Improvement Grants 1003(g) are additional funds available to districts with Tier I, II, or III schools as identified as Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) schools. Districts may apply for these grants on behalf of Title I school in improvement, corrective action, restructuring, or alternative governance designated as Tier I schools. The remaining Title I schools in improvement status, listed as Tier III schools, may be served with SIG funds after priority schools are served. Districts may also apply for Tier II schools which are high schools eligible for, but not receiving Title I funds.

Eligible Applicants

An LEA that receives Title I, Part A funds and that has one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools may apply for a SIG grant. Note that an LEA that is in improvement but that does not have any Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools is not eligible to receive SIG funds.

Allocations

The minimum award for each school will be \$50,000 per school for each of the three years (unless a shorter time period is needed). An LEAs maximum award will be no more than \$2 million per year for a three year period for each Tier I, II, or III school served.

If an SEA does not have sufficient SIG funds to support fully and effectively each school for which its LEAs have applied throughout the period of availability, an SEA must give priority to LEAs seeking to fund Tier I or Tier II schools.

Based on Need and Commitment

In addition to the objective measures used to determine need for the 1003(a) funds (poverty, enrollment, and level of need), each DISTRICT with eligible schools applying for funds under section SIG 1003(g) must demonstrate the need for the additional school improvement funds and commitment to carry out the requirements.

Greatest need: An LEA with the greatest need for a School Improvement Grant must have one or more schools in Tier I, II, or III.

Strongest Commitment: An LEA with the strongest commitment is an LEA that agrees to implement, and demonstrates the capacity to implement fully and effectively, one of the following

rigorous interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve: Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, or Transformational Models.

Four Models

Districts with Tier I or II schools must select one of the following models to implement.

Turnaround model: The LEA replaces the principal (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in past two years) and rehiring no more than 50% of the staff; gives greater principal autonomy; implements other prescribed and recommended strategies;

Restart model: The LEA converts or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, charter management organization, or education management organization;

School closure: The LEA closes the school and enrolls the students in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving; or

Transformation model: The LEA replaces the principal (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in past two years); implements a rigorous staff evaluation and development system; rewards staff who increase student achievement and/or graduation rates and removes staff who have not improved after ample opportunity; institutes comprehensive instructional reform; increases learning time and applies community-oriented school strategies; and provides greater operational flexibility and support for the school.

Conditions of Eligibility

SDDOE will consider applications from districts with Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) Tier I, II, or III schools.

Waiver to Implement a Schoolwide Program

Requests for waivers to enable a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school operating a targeted assistance program to operate a schoolwide program so it can implement a turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformational model should be made directly to the United States Department of Education. Such a waiver is necessary because a school operating a targeted assistance program may only provide Title I services to students who are most at risk of failing to meet State's student academic achievement standards; it may not provide services for the school as a whole. In order to operate a schoolwide program, a school must meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

The LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver. The waiver must be published for public comment prior to submission.

Budget and Accounting

The SIG 1003(g) awards must be used to **supplement** the level of funds available for the education of children in these schools. Therefore, these funds can supplement, but they **cannot be used to replace existing funding or services**.

The School Improvement Grant 1003(g) funds *must be tracked separately* from the Title I, Part A Basic Grant and the other Title I School Improvement funds distributed by formula under Section 1003(a). School Improvement funds are awarded for individual schools, therefore these funds must be accounted for at the individual school level.

Districts are to receipt improvement funds in the Title I revenue account and track each award separately by using a sub account number (operational unit and/or sub-object) for each Title I program. Expenditures for the School Improvement Grant 1003(g) funds should be tracked using the same sub account identifier.

Duration

Grant Periods:

Project Year 1: July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012

Project Year 2: July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013

Project Year 3: July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

These funds are contingent on renewed federal funding.

The SEA must renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to each Tier I or Tier II school that meets the annual student achievement goals established by the LEA and makes progress on the leading indicators. The SEA may renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to a school that does not meet its annual goals as it has discretion to examine factors such as the school's progress on the leading indicators or the fidelity with which it is implementing the model in deciding whether to renew the LEA's SIG grant. For a grant to be renewed with respect to a Tier III school, the school must meet the goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA, or make progress toward meeting those goals. See section II.C(a)(i)-(ii) of the final requirements. If the SEA determines that one or more of an LEA's schools do not warrant renewed funding, the SEA may continue to award the LEA SIG funds for other eligible schools. The SEA would reduce the LEA's grant, however, by the amount allocated for the schools for which funding is not being renewed.

The Application Process

Review and Approval Process: LEA applications will undergo review by a panel with facilitation. The panel will consist of members of the Committee of Practitioners and the School Support Team. Additional panel members will be recruited with expertise in curriculum, administration, and teacher evaluation. A rubric will be used to determine if LEA applications meet the

requirements of the grant and warrant approval. Each element will be scored based on the following scoring rubric:

Strong: Responses were thorough with sufficient detail

Moderate: Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications

Limited or None: Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given

The complete scoring rubric is attached at the end of the document.

The department will notify the LEAs of the day their application will be reviewed and will be asked to be available for a conference call if the panel has questions about their application. This will be an opportunity for districts to clarify the intent of their applications. Final scoring of the rubric and recommendations to the department will conclude the panel review process. LEAs with applications that are promising but do not fully meet each requirement will be contacted by the department for technical assistance in bringing the application into full compliance. LEA applications will not be approved unless all requirements are fully met.

Timeline: Upon approval of the State Application, the LEAs will be given a copy of the draft application package. A Live Meeting will be held at that time to go over the application and grant requirements. Districts will be asked to indicate their intent to apply for Tier I and II schools. Tier III applications will be sent out if warranted, based upon the number of Tier I and II schools LEAs intend to commit to serve and the amount of funding available. Technical assistance will be provided by department staff at the request of the district. LEA applications must be submitted within 30 working days. Awards are expected to be announced within three weeks after submission. Districts receiving grant awards may begin pre-implementation immediately, but no later than the first contract day for the 2011-2012 school year.

Applications must be submitted electronically by email. The application may be single spaced with appropriate spacing between sections, with font size of 12 or greater. Electronic submissions must be sent to Beth Schiltz. A follow-up paper copy of the cover page signed by the authorized representative and the school principal must be sent.

Technical Assistance

A Live Meeting will be held to provide LEAs with the LEA application and School Sections. An over view of PLA identification, SIG requirements, the four intervention models, and application procedures will be provided.

SEA staff are available to provide technical assistance at the request of the district. School Support Team members will also be assigned to help districts as they design their SIG applications.

Contact Information

For grant application questions:

Dr. Kristine Harms (773-6509)

Beth Schiltz (773-4716)

Kristine.Harms@state.sd.us

Beth.Schiltz@state.sd.us

For fiscal questions:

Rob Huffman (773-4600)

Paul Schreiner (773-7108)

Robyn.Huffman@state.sd.us

Paul.Schreiner@state.sd.us

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Specific information for each Tier I, II, and III school that the district applies to serve will be addressed in each school level section. Please answer these questions **from a district perspective**, taking into consideration each of the district's Tier I, II, and III schools.

(1) (Tier I, II, & III) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school. **(Must be at the district level)**

- a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. *Your answer must include the following: A list of the names of the members of the district committee and the position within the district that each person is representing. The committee must include a broad range of stakeholders including administrators, teachers, program directors, community members, and parents.*
- b. Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district's comprehensive needs assessment designed for the purpose of the SIG application. *Your answer must address data within the four lenses of the Data RetreatSM process: Student, Professional Practices, Programs & Structures, and Family & Community Data. Include an evaluation of current practices and programs as required in the third lens of data review. If any of the schools involved have had a school level audit based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSO, the results must be included in the data analysis.*

- c. Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) conducted for the purpose of the SIG application. *Your answer must include the following: **WHEN** the comprehensive needs assessment was conducted, give date (must be completed between application availability and application submission); **WHO** was involved with the analysis of the data; and **HOW** the comprehensive needs assessment was accomplished.*
 - d. Broadly describe the results of that review (specifics for each school will be outlined in the school sections). ***Summarize the results of the CNA for each school.***
 - e. List the strengths and weaknesses for each school based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. *These should be brief statements or phrases. Prioritize the areas that will be addressed with SIG funds.*
 - f. Provide the rationale the district used to determine which schools to serve with SIG funds and which schools not to serve. *Must address each Tier I and II school first, and then address each of the district's Tier III schools, if applicable.*
- (2)** (Tier I & II) The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- a. Describe the LEA's capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application. *What capacity does the district have to execute and support a turnaround or transformational model? Will the district contract with any person or organization to assist with the implementation of the turnaround or transformational model? What resources does the district have in terms of staffing, funding, support, partnerships, etc. that will assist the district in successfully implementing the chosen interventions? Differentiate what has already taken place and detailed plans for the future.*
 - b. Describe district administrative oversight. *Your answer must include who from the district will provide oversight of the SIG and how that will be accomplished.*
- (3)** (Tier I) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school. *The LEA must indicate the barriers or reasons why it lacks the capacity to serve all Tier I schools. Examples might be funding, minimum staffing for oversight, inability to close schools, geography or rural nature of district, lack of charter schools in the state, lack of qualified principals applying over the past years, district improvement, school improvement, multiple requirements to address.*
- (4)** (Tier I, II & III) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take.
- a. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. *Districts must describe what has been done to this point to design the interventions described in the school level sections. Plans for future action must be indicated. Broadly address all of the schools the district has committed to serve. School level sections will contain specific actions and timelines the district will meet in implementing the interventions for each school.*

- b. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. *Indicate the process used up to this point for selection of external providers. Provide a detailed plan for this process in the future. Who will be involved in the selection procedure? What criteria have been set?*
 - c. Align other resources with the interventions. *Describe other resources available to the district that will be leveraged to assist with interventions under SIG. Include participation in SDI+, Rtl, Math Counts, Reading Up, etc. Address resources in terms of funding, staffing, partnerships, and support.*
 - d. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. *Describe policies and practices that will need to be changed in order to fully implement the selected interventions. What barriers exist? Indicate the willingness of the district to modify procedures along the way if needed.*
 - e. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. *Describe how the district will continue the reform efforts once the SIG funds no longer exist. Address funding, staffing, and other resources that will be needed to sustain the reforms.*
- (5) (Tier I & II) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to pre-implement and implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application. *Highlight major events and benchmarks for all schools over the first year pre-implementation and the remaining three year implementation time period. The timeline should be from the district perspective.*
- (6) (Tier I & II) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds. *List the reading and math annual goals for each of the Tier I and II schools the district commits to serve. The districts must use the Dakota Step (indicator) to define their measurable goals which are based upon the percent of proficient students. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year.) Other goals should be set that are measurable and specify the indicator (district assessments) that will be used during each of the grant years.*
- (7) (Tier III) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. *Briefly describe the activities for all Tier III schools served. Specifics of the activities will be provided in each school section.*
- (8) (Tier III) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds. *List the reading and math annual goals for each of the Tier III schools the district commits to serve. The districts must use the Dakota Step (indicator) to define their measurable goals which are based upon the percent of proficient students. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year.) Other goals should be set that are measurable and specify the indicator (district assessments) that will be used during each of the grant years.*

- (9) (Tier I & II) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. *Describe consultation with school administration, teachers and other staff, and parents and community members. Indicate when and how the consultation took place.*

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

**School Budget categories for consideration in required budget narrative.
Aggregate school level budgets into a district level budget.**

Personnel: Salaries; paid to certificated individuals (i.e., certified teachers); staff that are not certificated (i.e., paraprofessionals, secretaries, teachers' aides, bus drivers).

Examples: Teacher: \$40,000 @ .5 FTE = \$20,000
Paraprofessional: \$15,000 @ 1 FTE = \$15,000

Employee Benefits: Payments made on behalf of employees that are not part of gross salary (i.e., insurance, Social Security, retirement, unemployment compensation, workers compensation, annual leave, sick leave).

Examples: \$20,000 X 7.65% (Social Security-Medicare) = \$1,530
\$15,000 X 7.65% (Social Security-Medicare) = \$3,000

Travel: Expenditures for staff travel, including mileage, airline tickets, taxi fare, meals, lodging, student transportation.

Examples: 3 trips X 400 miles X .37= \$4,440

Bus - 5 days per week X \$20 per day X 20 weeks = \$2,000

Equipment: Equipment should include tangible, nonexpendable personal property that has a useful life of more than one year. This should include all electronic equipment such as laptop and desktop computers. The grantee will be expected to maintain an equipment inventory list.

Examples: Desktop computers @ \$1200 = \$3600

Laptop computer -1 @ \$900 = \$900

Supplies: Consumable supplies include materials, software, videos, textbooks, etc.

Examples: Reading books - \$300

Software for Math assistance program - \$175

Contractual: (Purchased Services) Personal services rendered by personnel who are not employees of Local Education Agency (LEA), and other services the LEA may purchase; workshop & conference fees, tuition, contracted services, consultants, scoring services, rent, travel, etc.

Example: Company A – Provide professional development workshop - \$1,200

Professional Development: Include these professional development related costs in your annual budgets and budget narratives.

Example: Professional development conference – New York

Airfare - \$550

Registration - \$250

Meals – 3 days @ \$36 per day = \$108

Lodging – 2 days @ \$175 = \$350

Miscellaneous – Cab - \$50

Indirect Costs: Grantees must have an approved restricted indirect cost rate before indirect cost may be charged to this program.

Include a budget description for each year of the proposed 3 year project. Provide details linking expenditures to requirements of the intervention selected for Tiers I and II. Indicate expenses related to strategies to be used in Tier III schools.

Grant Periods:

Project Year 1: July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012

Project Year 2: July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013

Project Year 3: July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

Personnel:

Employee Benefits:

Travel:

Equipment:

Supplies:

Contractual:

Professional Development:

Indirect Costs

(Name) School District

**Budget Information
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

Budget Summary

Schools	Project Year 1 7/01/11 - 6/30/12 (a)		**Project Year 2 7/01/12 - 6/30/13 (b)	**Project Year 3 7/1/13 - 6/30/14 (c)	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Name of School & Tier					
Name of School & Tier					
Name of School & Tier					
Name of School & Tier					
District - Level Activities					
Total Costs					

*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

** Contingent upon renewed federal funding

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

By submitting this application, the LEA assures that it will do the following:

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
☐ I agree.
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
☐ I agree.
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
☐ I agree.
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.
☐ I agree.

E. WAIVERS: The SEA has requested waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant. The LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The SD DOE has requested and received the waivers below.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

F. WAIVERS: The SEA has not requested waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant. The LEA may apply for the following waiver.

The SD DOE has not requested the waiver below.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will apply. If the LEA does not intend to apply for the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver. The waiver must be published for public comment prior to submission.

- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT
SCORING RUBRIC
LEA APPLICATIONS**

Reviewer: _____

District: _____

Submitted By: _____

School(s): _____

Tier(s): _____

Sections	Strong Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	Moderate Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	Limited Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
(1) (Tier I, II and III) Descriptive Information a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. b. Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) designed for the purpose of the SIG application. c. Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment. d. Broadly describe the results of the review. (Summarize the results of the CNA for each school.) e. List the strengths and weaknesses for each school based on the results of the CNA. f. Provide the rationale the district used to determine which schools to serve with SIG funds and which schools not to serve.	a.	a.	a.
	b.	b.	b.
	c.	c.	c.
	d.	d.	d.
	e.	e.	e.
	f.	f.	f.

1. Descriptive Information Comments:

Sections	Strong Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	Moderate Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	Limited Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
(2) (Tier I and II) LEA Capacity – resources available for implementation of selected model. a. Describe the LEA’s capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application. b. Describe district administrative oversight.	a.	a.	a.
	b.	b.	b.
2. LEA Capacity Comments:			

Sections	Strong Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	Moderate Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	Limited Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 Points assigned for each component)
(3) (Tier I) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.			
3. Lacks Capacity Comments:			
(4) (Tier I and II) Rationale for the selection of an intervention model. a. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. b. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. c. Align other resources with the interventions. d. Modify its practice or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. e. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.	a.	a.	a.
	b.	b.	b.
	c.	c.	c.
	d.	d.	d.
	e.	e.	e.
4. Rationale Comments:			

Sections	Strong Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	Moderate Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	Limited Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
(5) (Tier I and II) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the application			
5. Timeline Comments:			
(6) (Tier I and II) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receives school improvement funds.			
6. Annual Goals Comments:			

Sections	Strong Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	Moderate Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 points assigned for each component)	Limited Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
(7) (Tier III) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement			
7. Tier III Schools Comments:			
(8) (Tier III) The LEA must describe the goals it has established in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.			
8. Tier III Schools Comments:			

Sections	Strong Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	Moderate Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	Limited Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
(9) (Tier I and II) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.			
9. Stakeholder Comments:			

Budget Narrative and Proposed Budget

Sections	Strong Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	Moderate Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	Limited Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
(Tier I, II and III) A budget narrative has been completed in the format requested in the application.			
(Tier I, II, and III) The LEA has requested sufficient funds to fully implement interventions selected for each school.			
(Tier I, II and III) Signed budget by the Business Manager and the Superintendent is provided.			
Comments:			

Approvals

Sections	Strong Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	Moderate Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	Limited Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
(Tier I, II and III) LEA School Board, Superintendent, and Principal have signed off on the proposal.			
Comments:			

Total Score: _____

Decision: ☐ Award grant ☐ Award grant with revisions ☐ Do Not Award Grant

[A value in any column other than the Strong column will require a revision before the grant can be awarded.]

Possible Points

Districts with just Tier I schools - 42 possible points
 Districts with just Tier II schools - 40 possible points
 Districts with just Tier III schools – points may vary depending on application and interventions

Districts with Tier I & II schools - 42 possible points
 Districts with Tier I & III schools – 46 possible points
 Districts with Tier II & III schools - 44 possible points
 Districts with schools in all 3 Tiers - 46 possible points

Applications will be ranked according to percent of possible points